LPA No. 220 of 2007

Dayanand Versus State of Haryana & another

Present : Mr. R.K.Malik, Advocate
for the appellant.

...

Learned counsel for the appellant has contended that a specific ground no. (iii) had been raised in the writ petition that the effect of the impugned orders Annexures P-6 and P-8 to the extent that suspension period has been restricted to the allowance already paid which amounted to stoppage of three increments with cumulative effect and deprived the petitioner 1/4th salary of three years, but the same has not been adjudicated upon by the learned Single Judge.

We have perused the impugned orders and have also perused the averments made in the writ petition.

In view of the fact that the learned Single Judge has not given any finding on the aforesaid specific ground raised by the counsel for the appellant, which according to the learned counsel had been argued, we remand the case back to the learned Single Judge for adjudication of the same.

The appeal stands disposed of.

(VIJENDER JAIN)
CHIEF JUSTICE

20.12.2007

(MAHESH GROVER)
JUDGE

dss